



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in the Mishnah. Finally, Prof. Bacher has printed nearly forty pages in Hebrew type, containing passages which he has discussed in the course of his studies or which illustrate Tanḥum's style. Grateful though every one will be to Prof. Bacher for this admirable contribution to Jewish literature, it is sincerely to be hoped that the Budapest scholar will yet be able to publish the complete edition of Tanḥum's dictionary in the near future.

S. A. COOK.

KENNEDY'S "NOTE-LINE IN THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES."

DR. JAMES KENNEDY'S *Note-Line in the Hebrew Scriptures*, commonly called *Pāsēq* or *Pēsēq* (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1903), is an elaborate discussion of the original use of this familiar mark. In his view it frequently indicates, more or less precisely, the spot where textual difficulties exist; it was employed by the scribes to draw attention to a noteworthy reading, in particular to assure the reader that the text as transmitted was that which actually stood in the MS. or MSS. from which they copied. After carefully examining and grouping the passages in which *Pāsēk* occurs, Dr. Kennedy concludes that, apart from indicating conflate readings (a notable instance in 1 Sam. iv. 18), and the omission of letters or words, it even marks an unusual form of the Divine Name, fixes certain readings where the initial letter of the second word is identical with the last in the preceding—in order to prevent an incorrect division, distinguishes between words of identical or similar form, and indicates superfluous letters or words. Since, in addition to all this, Dr. Kennedy finds that the line is sometimes used to mark rare words or forms, it will be seen that its scope is almost unlimited, and the only wonder is that it is not used more frequently.

If Dr. Kennedy's thesis were correct, we should have an important aid to the textual criticism of the Old Testament, but there are many difficulties in the way which he himself has not overlooked. In numerous cases where we should expect to find the line it is unaccountably missing. Not only the fifth chapter of Judges (p. 114), but even David's lament over Saul and Jonathan, and other passages where the text is admittedly doubtful, are without *Pāsēk*. Again, it is not seldom that no justifiable reason can be found for the presence of the line. In not a few of the cases wherein Dr. Kennedy is driven

to assume a textual corruption, the suspicions of the most thorough commentators had not been aroused, and every one will agree that in the interests of the study of textual criticism there are enough difficulties for the present without the suggestion that Pāseḳ is a danger-signal warning scholars to examine the text until by hook or by crook need for emendation can be discovered. Not the least of the difficulties in the way of accepting Dr. Kennedy's theory is the remarkable inconsistency with which the mark is used. If Bocheru (1 Chron. viii. 38) is marked because we should read *bēkōrō*, "his first-born" (p. 62), one expects a hint in 1 Chron. vi. 13 (28) that the name Vashni is really "and the second," the name having fallen out; and other examples of irregularity could easily be found.

Dr. Kennedy's attempt to find the period when the "note-line" was introduced is not very successful, and his evidence at all events must be viewed with caution. He observes that many of the readings, already marked by the line as questionable or unintelligible, appear in the Septuagint and other versions, and accordingly must be old (see p. 20). In several cases, however, many palpable textual difficulties are not marked, and this suggests to him that a large proportion of them arose after—perhaps long after—the line had been fixed upon (*ibid.*). That it dates from a pre-Christian century he takes for granted (pp. 10, 21), and since he finds that the words indicated by the line are sometimes corrected by the (later) *kēri* or by the *Sēbirin*, he concludes that the purpose of the line was subsequently forgotten (p. 13). The *terminus a quo* is, however, already fixed by Dr. Kennedy, since as the result of his observations he is convinced that it must have arisen "after the origin of 'final' forms in certain letters of the Hebrew alphabet" (p. 21). Now, it is true, we do not know exactly when the final letters were introduced, but at all events if this conclusion were justified, the line would scarcely be of pre-Christian origin. In מֵאֵרָן | יִצְחָק (Deut. ix. 7; p. 38) the line is explained as a note that the form is not the plural יִצְחָקִים, but if final letters were in use this would be unnecessary. It would have been more plausible had the writer treated the passage under the cases of omission on p. 54 et seq. Two other singular explanations of the line may be mentioned. In Ezek. xvi. 52 (p. 38) it is assumed that in the group גַּם אֵת שְׂאֵי the verb might have been read תִּשְׂאֵי (what becomes of אָ?); in Ps. lxi. 14 (p. 100) it is proposed to restore "the verb-form תִּפְלְחֵי" for תִּפְלְחֵי (followed by Pāseḳ)!

Dr. Kennedy has thoroughly investigated his subject, he appends a complete list of the passages in which the mark appears, and this alone will be of considerable value to other workers at this problem, but he has failed to prove his theory. If the simplicity of the sign is

a mark of its antiquity, one may express surprise that the earlier scribes did not go further and emend the text which they conceived to be faulty. Certainly its position—in the text itself—is note worthy, but this is scarcely a sign of age. It would be an advantage if some analogy could be found for the line, but it is difficult to find one. Assyrian uses two short strokes, arranged vertically (like Sillôk) to indicate that two words or sentences are not connected, and a vertical line is also used to mark an important person or thing, sometimes even it is employed as a comma; various curious lines of obscure application are frequently found upon the Sinaitic inscriptions, but none of these throw any light upon the Pāsēk. Students of classical palaeography, however, might be able to provide a clue.

S. A. COOK.

H. P. SMITH'S "OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY."

THE volumes of the *International Theological Library* (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1903) are always welcome, and its Old Testament History is the one likely to appeal to the widest circle of readers. The critical study of Old Testament literature is one of unusual difficulty, and the majority of Biblical students are satisfied to content themselves with an exposition of the results. How Biblical history reads in the light of criticism is the task that was entrusted to Professor H. P. Smith, and those who knew this American scholar's commentary on the Books of Samuel in the *International Critical Commentary* did not doubt but that the volume would be a valuable and helpful piece of work. Prof. Smith's history is indeed worthy of the series to which it belongs: it is neither patchy nor ponderous, neither overladen nor superficial. It presupposes critical investigations, but at the same time it is perfectly independent. "Every new advance in criticism involves a re-writing of history" (p. vii), he states, and readers will find that the author's critical conclusions are often more advanced than, let us say, Prof. Driver's *Introduction* in the same series.

After a preliminary statement of historical principles and the growth of Old Testament study, Prof. Smith deals briefly with the literary sources. The history of tradition is the prelude to an inquiry of the facts which lie behind tradition, and in Chapters II and III he discusses the traditions in Genesis—the Hebrews' theory of their origin and earliest history—and finds in them "historical relations